



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Advocate of Peace

VOL. 84

JANUARY, 1922

No. 1

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

(1815-1828)

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable address, "Ampax, Washington")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate Subscription Price, \$2.00 a year. Single copies, twenty cents each.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

ACHIEVEMENTS ON THE WAY

UNDOUBTEDLY the Washington Conference is achieving results. Aside from the fact that it is not a Paris conference, but a peace-time conference, and that it is laying the foundations for the extension of the rules of law and order, there is a substantial agreement in the Naval Committee that the capital-ship ratio—United States, 5; Great Britain, 5; Japan, 3; France, 1.75; Italy, 1.75—shall stand. In spite of the fact that exact definitions as to the area in which the *status quo* is to apply to the fortifications of the Pacific have not been agreed upon, enough has been decided in the Naval Committee to indicate achievement. Then there is the adoption in the Naval Committee of the Root submarine resolutions, restating the old laws governing visit and search, and the rescuing of passengers and crew, including the proposal that violations of this law be made acts of piracy. There is the agreement as between the five powers that no merchantman shall be sunk by a submarine. There will be invitations to the other powers to give their assent, and thus make the agreement international law for all.

While it has not been possible to agree upon a method of restricting submarine and auxiliary craft tonnage, there is an agreement to limit auxiliaries to a maximum of eight-inch guns and battleships to a maximum of sixteen-inch guns. There is an agreement as between the five powers to a rule to prohibit the use of poison gas in warfare, accompanied by an invitation to the other

powers to give their assent, and thus to make this agreement also international law for all.

While it does not seem possible to come to any agreement as to the restriction of aerial warfare, there is a tentative provision for a commission to study the subject. Of course, the Four-Power Treaty, with its abrogation of the Anglo-Japanese pact, is an achievement of the Conference as a whole. This same thing is true of the Root rules securing national integrity, maintaining the open door, promoting stable government, and refraining from taking advantage of existing conditions to seek advantages at the expense of others in China.

It is evident that the Conference as a whole will adopt the committee proposal to abolish foreign post-offices in China by January 1, 1923. China's control over her tariffs is to be decidedly widened. There is an agreement in committee to fit the 5 per cent tariff to the modern commercial situation. Indeed, there is an agreement to set up an international commission, which shall meet in China, to study the question of raising the rate from 5 to 7½ per cent and to allow an additional 5 per cent on luxuries. The whole question of extraterritorial rights in China has been referred to a commission for study and report. As soon as China shows that she can maintain order, foreign troops are to be taken out of that country. It has been agreed to restore China's rights over wireless communications.

Surely there is nothing here to justify such friends of the League of Nations, as, for instance, its Publicity Director, in speaking slightly of the work in Washington. Since, for example, China accepted the Four-Power Treaty, it does not seem pertinent to accuse the Conference of "excluding China." In the *New York Times* of January 8 this Director is quoted as saying:

"The agreement adopted by five powers on submarine warfare declares that certain rules are 'deemed an established part of international law.' Who makes international law? Can five powers, without consultation with the rest, arbitrarily hand down a ukase that binds fifty other nations?"

Certainly not. And if the critic would spare the time to read the agreement, he would note that there is no "ukase" involved. The purpose is to make the agreement international law as for the powers ratifying. It is proposed to invite the other nations to accept the principle, to the end that by their acceptance the principle may become international law for all the nations.

We do not feel that this critic is justified either in asking, "Why is it necessary in this day of democracy to

go about the matter as if it were the secret business of a few great powers, and what will be the effect on other submarine-owning nations who have not been consulted?" In the light of the methods followed in Paris, this question is interesting. Of course, there is nothing going on in Washington to warrant the aspersion that it is a "secret business of a few great powers." Our own view is that the friends of the League of Nations achieve for themselves no benefit by the oracular statement, that "the world cannot be saved by three or four nations, no matter how powerful their armaments may be." The conference in Washington is concerning itself with concrete problems relating particularly to the nations here represented. It is not true that "the voluntary co-operation of all nations, acting in concert, is essential to any effective solution of international difficulties." As a matter of experience, probably 99 per cent of "international difficulties" are settled between not to exceed two parties to a dispute.

The simple fact is that great difficulties are being met and overcome in Washington. European friends of the League of Nations have been very gracious in their references to the Washington Conference. The Washington Conference casts no aspersions upon the League of Nations. The American friends of the League of Nations are for the most part, we believe, friendly to the efforts in Washington. That is the way it should be.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY LOOKING UP

THERE ARE many evidences that American foreign policy is coming once more unto its own. Of course, there is our Washington Conference; but there are other evidences. The shipment of arms and munitions to countries in which there are domestic disturbances can be stopped by the President, under the provisions of a bill passed by the Congress and now in the hands of the President for approval. This action on the part of the Congress is said to be in harmony with the action of other governments, following negotiations by the American Department of State.

American statesmanship seems about to play an important part in the settlement of the Tacna-Arica dispute, a dispute hanging fire between Chile and Peru since the Ancon Treaty of October 20, 1883, the treaty which brought to an end the war between these two countries. This effort on the part of the American Government to bring the two South American States together follows repeated failures on the part of the governments concerned to have the question settled. The self-explanatory text of the American note to the two governments reads:

"The Government of the United States, through the courtesy of the Ambassadors of Chile and Peru in Washington, has been kept informed of the progress of the recent negotiations, carried on directly by telegram between the governments of Chile and Peru, looking toward a settlement of the long-standing controversy with respect to the unfulfilled provisions of the Treaty of Ancon. It has noted with the greatest pleasure and satisfaction the lofty spirit of conciliation which has animated the two governments, and that as a result of the direct exchanges of views the idea of arbitration of the pending difficulties is acceptable in principle to both. It has also taken note of the suggestion that representatives of the two governments be named to meet in Washington with a view to finding the means of settling the difficulties which have divided the two countries.

"Desiring, in the interest of American peace and concord, to assist in a manner agreeable to both governments concerned in finding a way to ending this long-standing controversy, the President of the United States would be pleased to welcome in Washington the representatives which the governments of Chile and Peru may see fit to appoint, to the end that such representatives may settle, if happily it may be, the existing difficulties, or may arrange for the settlement of them by arbitration."

There are still other evidences of the vital push of the American spirit. The conference at Cannes was undoubtedly inspired by the conference in Washington. And now we are to have a conference in March at Genoa—a conference to include Russia and Germany, a conference leading to that association of European States so necessary for the maintenance of peace in the world. So important is the resolution adopted by the Supreme Council at Cannes, January 6, calling this conference of all European States, that it may well be read in its entirety. The resolution reads:

"The allied powers, met in conference, are unanimously of the opinion that a conference of an economic and financial nature should be called during the first weeks of March, at which all the European powers, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Russia included, should be invited to send representatives. They consider that such a conference constitutes an urgent and essential step toward the economic reconstruction of central and eastern Europe. They are of the firm opinion that the prime ministers of each nation ought, if possible, to take part themselves at this conference, so that the recommendations can be acted on as quickly as possible.

"The allied powers consider that the restoration of the international commerce of Europe, as well as the development of the resources of all countries, are necessary to increase the amount of productive labor and lessen the suffering endured by the European peoples.

"A common effort by the most powerful States is necessary to render to the European system its vitality, which is now paralyzed.

"This effort ought to be applied to the suppression of all obstacles in the way of commerce. It ought to be applied also to granting large credits to the most feeble